UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN SOUTHERN DIVISION

STEELCASE, INC. a Michigan corporation,

Plaintiff,

٧.

Case No.: 1:04cv0026 Hon. Robert Holmes Bell Chief, U. S. District Judge

HARBIN'S INC., an Alabama corporation, MICHAEL G. HARBIN and HOPE D. HARBIN PATTERSON.

Defendants.

MILLER, JOHNSON, SNELL & CUMMISKEY, P. L. C. Jon G. March (P17065)
Attorneys for Plaintiff 250 Monroe Avenue, N. W. - Suite 800 P. O. Box 306
Grand Rapids, MI 49501-0306 (616) 831-1700

HOPE D. HARBIN - PATTERSON Defendant in Pro Per 4514 Chamblee Dunwoody Rd. - 238 Atlanta, GA 30338-6202 (770) 451-0730 SILVERMAN, SMITH, BINGEN & RICE, P.C. Robert W. Smith (P31192) Attorneys for Defendant Michael G. Harbin 151 S. Rose Street 707 Comerica Building Kalamazoo, MI 49007 (269) 381-2090

DEFENDANT MICHAEL G. HARBIN'S OBJECTION TO MOTION OF PLAINTIFF STEELCASE, INC. FOR LEAVE TO FILE REPLY BRIEF

In the Reply of Plaintiff Steelcase, Inc. to Defendant's Brief in Opposition of Motion of Plaintiff Steelcase, Inc. to Amend Case Management Order, Plaintiff states at page 3:

Plaintiff requests the extension of time within which to amend the pleadings to allow for review of the deposition transcript for sufficient evidence to support an additional count against Defendant Harbin and to consider alternative sources for providing the relevant records and the legal effect of the destruction of nearly all corporate records...(Emphasis

added.)

This statement would lead the Court to believe that Defendant Michael G. Harbin

("Harbin") testified that he destroyed nearly all corporate records of Defendant Harbin's,

Inc. That is simply not true.

Harbin testified that he conducted a going out of business sale on behalf of

Defendant Harbin's, Inc.'s largest secured creditor who tightly controlled the sale. He

testified that when he left Harbin's, Inc. on the last day of the going out of business sale,

he left behind the corporate records which remained in the possession of the secured

creditor. He testified that he believed that the records were probably "in the Montgomery

County landfill" because he believed that is what the bank did with them.

It is misleading to suggest to this Court that Plaintiff Steelcase, Inc. ought to be

allowed to file a reply brief based on an implication that Harbin destroyed the corporate

records of Defendant Harbin's, Inc. because it simply is not true.

Dated: February 4, 2005

SILVERMAN, SMITH, BINGEN & RICE, P.C.

Case No.: 1:04cv0026

Attorneys for Defendant Michael G. Harbin

Robert W. Smith (P31192)

Steelcase, Inc. v Michael G. Harbin, et. al. Objection to Plaintiff's Reply to Defendant's Brief in Opposition of Plaintiff's Motion to Amend Case Management Order

Page 2